



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,937	05/05/2000	ALEKSANDR FYEDOROVICH LUKIN	VISP-2	6347

7590 07/01/2002

J HAROLD NISSEN  
LACHENBACK SIEGEL MARZULLO ARONSON & GREENSPAN  
ONE CHASE ROAD  
PENTHOUSE SUITE  
SCARSDALE, NY 10583

EXAMINER

ENG, GEORGE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/530,937	LUKIN, ALEKSANDR FYEDOROVICH
Examiner	Art Unit	
George Eng	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office action is in response to amendment filed 4/11/2002 (paper no. 9).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baratz et al. (US PAT. 5,742,596 hereinafter Baratz) in view of the prior art admitted by applicant (RU PAT. 2,105,425 hereinafter Skigin et al.).

Regarding claim 1, Baratz discloses a communication network for a structure site (10) as shown in figure 1 comprising a local computer network (37) connecting computers (40) at the transmitting and receiving ends of system through network adapters (43), and telephone sets (42) connected to said local computer network to provide telephone communication between the parties at the transmitting and receiving ends with an interface module (172) having telephone interfaces (102) according to the number of telephone sets, wherein it is provided with a computer telephony server (44) connected to the local computer network (37) and to a general telephone network (12), wherein each telephone set is being connected to the local computer

network directly through a telephone adapter (102) and a network adapter (43) connected in series thereto in order to transfer voice data over the local computer network (col. 4 line 6 through col. 6 line 6 and col. 9 lines 6-41). In addition, Baratz discloses the telephone adapter is being operated to convert analog signal to and from digital signal (col. 8 line 56-58), user call signals into addresses of other telephone adapters connected to said local computer network such as making internal calls (col. 6 lines 1-6), and hang-up signals (col. 5 lines 65-66). Baratz differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching to convert analog signal to and from digital signal adapted to the clock frequency of the local network. However, it is notoriously well known in the art of an interface is designed as an analog/digital signal converter adapted to the clock frequency of the local network in order to allow the same channels to be used to transmit computer data and to maintain voice communication, for example see Skigin (specification, page 8 liens 5-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baratz in having the functions of the interface, as per teaching of Skigin, because it makes the communication process simpler and cutting its costs.

Regarding claim 2, Baratz teaches computers (40) connected to the local computer network (37) for providing with multimedia software, i.e., application, for directly transmitting digitized voice data over said local computer network for communications (col. 5 lines 31-40 and col. 6 lines 48-51).

Regarding claim 3, Baratz discloses the telephone adapter as shown in figure 4 comprising a processor (112) having software to allow exchange of digital data to be effected within the framework of common network protocol (col. 5 lines 38-53, col. 8 lines 63-67 and col. 9 lines 27-35). Baratz differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a particular

combination of elements including a signal-distributor, a tone dialing recognition device, a recognized number transmission device, a compressor, a voice and tone signal transmission priority device, a voice signal transmitter, and a decompressor in the telephone adapter. However, Skigin discloses the telephone adapter comprising a transmitting and receiving ends, wherein the transmitting ends has a signal detector-distributor with an input connected to a telephone set, a first output of said signal detector-distributor being connected to the input of a tone dialing recognition device having its output connected to the input of a recognized number transmission device, which has its output connected to the local computer network, a second output of the signal detector-distributor being connected to the input of an analog-to-digital converter having its output connected the input of a compressor whose output is connected to a processor unit and the reception channel having a voice and tone signal transmission priority device having its output connected to the telephone set and a first input connected to the output of a call signal dialer, whose input is connected to a call number data converter having its input connected to the local computer network through the network adapter, a second input of the voice and tone signal transmission priority device being connected to the output of a voice signal transmitter, whose input is connected to the output of a decompressor having its input connected to the processor unit (specification, page 3 line 30 through page 4 line 22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Baratz in having the telephone adapter with a structure as taught by Skigin because it provides new opportunities for signal transmission and reception using general-purpose equipment.

Regarding claim 4, Baratz discloses that the processor unit (112) is a central processor connected to digital data input-output device (114), and to a control (116) having a stored program memory and a random access memory via host interface (118) to allow exchange of digital data to be effected within the framework of common network protocol (col. 8 lines 63-67 and col. 9 lines 27-35).

Regarding claim 5, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 1. In addition, Baratz also discloses to maintain telephone communication between remote structure sites with the structure site (10), i.e., a first site, such that the local computer network of each remote site is being provided with a router (48) connected thereto and to a router of the local computer network of at least one other site through communication channel of the computer networks of the remote structure sites (col. 4 lines 51-67). Note while Baratz teaches that traffic originating from one node within a segment to another node within the same segment reduces unnecessary load on the rest of the network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify each successive site having an internal telephone network duplicating the telephone network of the first site in order to reduce unnecessary load on the rest of the network.

Regarding claim 6, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 7, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 8, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 9, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 11, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 12, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 4/11/2002 (paper no. 9) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the connection of the interface module directly to the local computer network connecting computers) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Eng whose telephone number is (703) 308-9555. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 7 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4708.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



CURTIS KUNTZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

GEORGE ENG  
PATENT EXAMINER

ART UNIT 2643